

REMARKS

Claims 10, as herein amended, claims 14 and 15, as previously presented, and claims 11, 12, 18-20 and 23 as filed are pending in the application. Claims 1-9, 13, 16, 17, 21, 22, 24-36 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, for pursuit in related applications.

The Advisory Action asserts that Applicant's previously presented arguments were that the prior art disclosed apoptotic bodies produced as the result of a specific treatment, and that the claims do not limit the patient population from which the samples are obtained.

For clarity, Applicants have amended claim 10 to recite that extracellular RNA is obtained from pleural effusion, something not disclosed in any of the cited art. Without reiterating arguments made in prior response, Applicant respectfully contends that the combination of the Kopreski reference, the Kang abstract and the Mok reference do not render obvious the instant claims due to multiple deficiencies, as follows:

1. None of the cited art teaches that extracellular RNA is present in pleural effusions.
2. None of the cited art teaches that apoptotic bodies are present in pleural effusions.
3. None of the cited art teaches methods for extracting, separating, isolating, or purifying apoptotic bodies from pleural effusion.
4. None of the cited art teaches that apoptotic bodies in pleural effusion contain RNA.

Applicant thus respectfully contends that the asserted rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 has been overcome by amendment and traversed by argument, and requests that the Examiner withdraw this ground of rejection.

CONCLUSIONS

Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request that the pending claims be passed to issue.

If Examiner Natarajan believes it to be helpful, she is invited to contact the undersigned representative by telephone at (312) 913-0001.

Respectfully submitted,
McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP

Dated: October 20, 2010

By: /Kevin E. Noonan/
Kevin Noonan, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 35,303